Case 2:15-cv-04006-DMG-JEM Document 7 Filed 06/02/15 Page 1 of 5 Page ID #:32

1 <u>Dow Chemical Co.</u>, 443 F.3d 676, 682 (9th Cir. 2006); <u>Gaus</u>, 980 F.2d at 566-67. "Under the plain 2 terms of § 1441(a), in order properly to remove [an] action pursuant to that provision, [the 3 removing defendant] must demonstrate that original subject-matter jurisdiction lies in the federal 4 courts." Syngenta Crop Protection, 537 U.S. at 33. Failure to do so requires that the case be remanded, as "[s]ubject matter jurisdiction may not be waived, and . . . the district court must 5 remand if it lacks jurisdiction." Kelton Arms Condo. Owners Ass'n v. Homestead Ins. Co., 346 6 F.3d 1190, 1192 (9th Cir. 2003). "If at any time before final judgment it appears that the district 7 court lacks subject matter jurisdiction, the case shall be remanded." 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). It is 8 9 "elementary that the subject matter jurisdiction of the district court is not a waivable matter and may be raised at anytime by one of the parties, by motion or in the responsive pleadings, or sua 10 sponte by the trial or reviewing court." Emrich v. Touche Ross & Co., 846 F.2d 1190, 1194 n.2 11 (9th Cir. 1988). 12 From a review of the Notice of Removal and the state court records provided, it is evident 13 that the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over the instant case, for the following reasons. 14 15 No basis for federal question jurisdiction has been identified: 16 The Complaint does not include any claim "arising under the Constitution, laws, 17 or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 1331. 18 Removing defendant(s) asserts that the affirmative defenses at issue give rise to federal question jurisdiction, but "the existence of federal jurisdiction depends 19 solely on the plaintiff's claims for relief and not on anticipated defenses to those 20 claims." ARCO Envtl. Remediation, L.L.C. v. Dept. of Health and Envtl. Quality, 213 F.3d 1108, 1113 (9th Cir. 2000). An "affirmative defense based on federal law" 21 does not "render[] an action brought in state court removable." Berg v. Leason, 32 22 F.3d 422, 426 (9th Cir. 1994). A "case may not be removed to federal court on the basis of a federal defense . . . even if the defense is anticipated in the plaintiff's 23 complaint, and even if both parties admit that the defense is the only question truly at issue in the case." Franchise Tax Bd. v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust, 24 463 U.S. 1, 14 (1983). 25 The underlying action is an unlawful detainer proceeding, arising under and 26 governed by the laws of the State of California.

27

Case 2:15-cv-04006-DMG-JEM Document 7 Filed 06/02/15 Page 3 of 5 Page ID #:34

	B. Do you own any cash, or do you have money in a checking or savings account? (Include any funds in prison accounts, if applicable.)	
	If the answer is yes, identify each account a the six (6) months prior to the date of this de	and separately state the amount of money held in each account for each of eclaration.
4.	Do you own any real estate, stocks, bonds, notes, automobiles, or other valuable property (excluding ordinary household furnishings and clothing)? Yes PNo If the answer is yes, describe the property and state its approximate value: In what year did you last file an Income Tax return? 2013	
5.		
	Approximately how much income did your la	ast tax return reflect? \$20,000.00
6.	List the persons who are dependent upon your for support, state your relationship to those persons, and indicate how much you contribute toward their support: n/a	
I und furth (18 U	J.S.C. Sections 1621, 3571).	y question in this declaration will subject me to penalties for perjury. I term of imprisonment of up to five (5) years and/or a fine of \$250,000
_	CALIFORNIA State	
	State	LOS ANGELES
		LOS ANGELES County (or City)
I, JAC	CQUALINE D. DAVIS oing is true and correct.	